DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 941 JC 720 115

TITLE	Teaching and Learning for Educationally Disadvantaged Students in Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION	Chicago City Coll., Ill. Kennedy-King Coll.
PUB DATE	Mar 72
NOTE	35p.; A summary report of two U.S. Office of Education EPDA Workshops held under the auspices of the Masters College Program for Preparing Community College Teachers, Chicago, Illinois, Oct. 4-7 and Nov. 15-18, 1971
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Faculty; Disadvantaged Youth; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Internship Programs; *Junior Colleges; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Education; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Improvement; Workshops

ABSTRACT

In 1969 the Research Division of the U.S. Office of Education supported the development of a model for a "Masters College" which is a combined 4-year undergraduate and graduate program that integrates the last two years of college with professional preparation at the master's level for training junior college teachers. One outcome of this research was two workshops on community college teaching; the results of which are summarized in this paper. Participants came from New York, Massachusetts, Illinois, and Washington and included community college teachers and administrators and university staff responsible for preparing community college faculty. While the original topic of the workshop was "teaching and learning for educationally disadvantaged students," the conclusions and recommendations apply to the preparation of all junior college teachers. Topics discussed included: the pros and cons of behavioral objectives, institutional climate and its effect on teaching, criteria for evaluating remedial programs, characteristics of an effective teacher, and the importance of internships and in-service training for improving teaching effectiveness. Students' opinions on these topics were sought and included in the discussions. The possibility of initiating Masters Colleges in the geographic areas represented by the participants was also an item of concern at both workshops. The document includes part of the original Office of Education research study describing the Masters College model. (LP)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 061941

TEACHING AND LEARNING FOR EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A Summary Report

of two U.S. Office of Education EPDA Workshops

held under the auspices of the

Masters College Program

for Preparing Community College Teachers

Arlington Towers Hotel, Chicago, Illinois
October 4 to 7 and November 15 to 18, 1971

sponsored by Kennedy-King College of Chicago

in cooperation with

Governors State University, Park Forest Sou'h, Illinois

Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey

Stockton State College, Pomona, New Jersey

University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts

Western Washington State College, Bellingham, Washington

JC 720 115

March 1972

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 7 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

CONTENTS

Introductory Note, J. Dudley Dawson..... 3

Participants..... 4

The First Workshop..... 6

Getting a Perspective 6

Social Status and Learning 7

The System, Performance Objectives, and the Curriculum 7

Institutional Climate 8

Criteria for Remedial Programs 9

A Good Teacher Knows Where You're Coming From 10

The Teacher as Learner 11

The Second Workshop.....13

Knowing How Living Is Done 13

Overcoming Second-Handedness 14

Two-Way Acculturation 15

Selecting Candidates 16

Some Preliminary Questions 17

The Flooded Maze 18

Good Interns Dig People 19

Conclusion: A New Collaboration 20

Appendices.....22

I. Illinois Guidelines 22

II. New England Guidelines 24

III. New Jersey Guidelines 27

IV. Washington Guidelines 28

V. Masters College Abstract 31

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The two workshops summarized in this report were an outgrowth of a project supported by the Research Division of the United States Office of Education to develop a model for a "Masters College" to prepare teachers for the country's proliferating community colleges. The study was published by the Union of Experimenting Colleges and Universities, Yellow Springs, Ohio, in March 1971. An abstract accompanies the report. While the Masters College study was comprehensive in its scope, it included the general topic of the workshops: teaching and learning for "educationally disadvantaged" students.

The sponsoring institutions received an EPDA grant to conduct two four-day sessions centered on the preparation of teachers for educationally disadvantaged students. Kennedy-King College, located in the heart of south Chicago, generously acted as host and fiscal agent for the project. It was joined by nine other community colleges associated with the five state colleges and universities in exploring the possibility of initiating Masters College programs in their geographic areas.

The first workshop, held in October 1971, concluded that the teaching and learning of high risk students should not be treated as isolated elements in preparing community college teachers. Accordingly, the second workshop, which convened a month later, adopted a more general approach. It concentrated on the education of teachers within the context of community college goals. Because the Masters College concept was predicated on preparing teachers who could relate to the great diversity of needs among community college students, the second workshop responded to questions posed by the Masters College study.

In the second workshop, the four geographic groups concentrated on framing appropriate guidelines for the selection and professional preparation of community college teachers. The discussion that preceded the conclusions embodied in these guidelines reveals the educational experience, social awareness, and humane insight of the workshop participants.

It is our hope that this report will be a small contribution to increasing the ability of our community colleges to meet the implied challenge of Sam DeBose, recently a community college student himself: "A good teacher or counsellor is a guy who knows where you're coming from .... He should have whatever goes out and gets a feeling about the lives of others."

--J. Dudley Dawson
Project Director

1109 Livermore Street
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

PARTICIPANTS

Note: I and/or II after the participant's name indicates whether the individual attended the first and/or second workshop.

Illinois

CENTRAL YMCA COMMUNITY COLLEGE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
Jagdish P. Dave, Chairman, Department of Psychology and Education (I)
Noreen Dowling, Dean, Liberal Arts and Sciences (II)
George McCree, Director, Student Activities (II)

GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY, PARK FOREST SOUTH, ILLINOIS 60466
Marvin A. Brottman, Professor, Urban Teacher Education (I)
Tilman Cothran, Vice President for Academic Affairs (I & II)
Douglas I Davis, Administrative Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (I & II)
Sam DeBose, Student (I)
James J. Gallagher, Professor of Science Education (I)
W. P. McLemore, Professor of Human Learning and Development (II)
Robert P. Press, Professor of Comparative Education and African Studies (I)
Geraldine S. Williams, Director of Academic Development, College of Business and Public Service (II)

KENNEDY-KING COLLEGE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60621
Ewen Akin, Vice President for Academic Affairs (I & II)
Margaret Burroughs, Professor of Humanities (I)
Vivian Moore, Student (I)
Maurice M. McNeil, Co-Chairman, English Department (I & II)

THORNTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE, SOUTH HOLLAND, ILLINOIS 60473
L. Donald Farquar, Director, General and Experimental Studies (II)
Robert L. Jack, Deputy Vice President for Academic Affairs (I)
Lenore Mendoza, Student (I)
Wayne Willard, Vice President for Academic Affairs (II)

New England

CAPE COD COMMUNITY COLLEGE, WEST BARNSTABLE, MASSACHUSETTS 02668
Larry L. DeBower, Faculty, Humanities Division (I & II)

HARTFORD STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGE, HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106
James L. Brother, Faculty, English Department (I & II)

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS, AMHERST, MASSACHUSETTS 01002
Cleo Abraham, Center for Urban Education (I)
William Lauroesch, Director of Community College Affairs (I & II)
Wobert Miltz, Director, Microteaching Laboratory (II)

New Jersey

ATLANTIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE, MAYS LANDING, NEW JERSEY 08406
Thomas V. Chelius, Faculty Member (I)
Ronald S. Hert, Faculty, English Department (II)
Barbara A. Phillips, Counsellor, Community Services (II)

CAMDEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE, CHERRY HILL, NEW JERSEY 08034
Mary A. Visceglia, Faculty Member (I)

ESSEX COUNTY COLLEGE, NEWARK, NEW JERSEY 07102
Chandler Dennis, Teaching Intern in Physics (II)
David Griffiths, Chairman, Department of Physics and Engineering (II)

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY 08903
Charles R. Doty, Adviser on Technical Education (II)

STOCKTON STATE COLLEGE, POMONA, NEW JERSEY 08201
Samuel L. Creighton, Program for the Educationally Disadvantaged (I)
Candace Falk, Faculty, General Studies Division (II)
Leonard Solo, Teacher Development Program (I)
Jacquelyn Stanton, Psychology Department (I)

Washington

GREEN RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE, AUBURN, WASHINGTON 98002
Pat Dupree, Faculty, English Department (II)

SHORELINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98133
J. David Wright (I)

WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98100
Pio J. de Cano, Staff Member (I)
Cal Dupree, Special Assistant, Native American Education (II)
Richard G. Moe, Education Program Director (II)

Resource Leaders

Chandler Dennis, Essex County College, Newark, New Jersey (II)
Roger Garrison, Westbrook Junior College, Portland, Maine (II)
David Griffiths, Essex County College, Newark, New Jersey (II)
Verne Haubrick, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin (I)
Jewel Graham, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio (I)
William Moore, Jr., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (I)

Workshop Staff

Ewen Akin, Kennedy-King College, Co-Chairman
Tilman Cothran, Governors State University, Co-Chairman
J. Dudley Dawson, Project Director, Yellow Springs, Ohio
Phillips Ruopp, Yellow Springs, Ohio, Consultant and Summarizer

THE FIRST WORKSHOP

Getting a Perspective

In his remarks during the workshop's first session, Maceo Bowie, President of Kennedy-King College, spoke of the community colleges as "the poor people's college (where) teachers have an excellent opportunity to address themselves to the...racism which has done so much to polarize our country ...."

The experience of Kennedy-King College, with ninety-six percent of its students from Chicago's black ghetto, contradicts the notion that "educationally disadvantaged" students need special programs. What they need are teachers with the right attitudes who are ready to change their methods and techniques. Special programs can be a dead end. President Bowie urged the workshop to put blacks in perspective straight across the board. Later Jewel Graham asked if it didn't throw a different light on things to talk about education of the oppressed rather than education of the disadvantaged.

If any concern dominated the first workshop, it was the effort to put the community college and its poor and minority students into perspective, to recognize their diversity and the wide spectrum of educational needs in the nation's public two-year colleges.

Our discussion of the community college's purpose might be boiled down to the agreement that the business of the community college is to meet the unmet educational needs of its community's adults. By adult we meant anyone who was beyond high school age, anyone who would be more likely to respond to an adult learning environment than a setting heavy with the vestiges of adolescent schooling.

The group recognized that there are many different kinds of educational voids, depending on the student's life situation. Deprivation can be found in professional as well as welfare homes, in the suburbs as well as the inner city. That is why it is a mistake to label students "educationally disadvantaged" and isolate them in remedial programs. Instead of undermining the student's sense of personal worth because of his needs, we should concentrate our efforts on the creation of a variety of options and provide counselling that will enable students to identify and use the resources available to them.

Social Status and Learning

Teachers and counsellors in the community college must abandon their conventional image of the college student. They need to know the characteristics of their students well enough to be specific about the resources, styles, methods, and techniques which will help them reach their educational goals. Tilman Cothran pointed out that there is a strong tendency to explain the educationally disadvantaged student in terms of his weaknesses when the real problem is lack of understanding of his interests and capacities. Because young people from the ghetto, for example, are more responsive to what can be seen and heard and done does not mean that they are incapable of abstraction. They abstract from experience that is sharply different from the circumstances of middle class life, with its emphasis on careers requiring academic credentials. Inevitably, the ghetto student's abstract thought is about a different order of phenomena. Community colleges should be the first to take into account the impact of social status on learning. Productive student-teacher relations begin in the teacher's active appreciation of the ability of poor and minority students to negotiate their own environment and survive in a hostile world.

The teacher's attitude toward social change is one indicator of his attitude toward the community college, its students, and change in education. Does he equate curricular change with lower academic standards? One of the root problems in teacher-students relations is the gulf between their class cultures. Most teachers in inner-city colleges haven't lived where most of their students live. Some participants felt that teachers who transfer to community colleges from high schools with a similar social profile bring to their community college responsibilities more insight and seasoned skill. Others thought that their attitudes and practices were often contrary to the spirit of an adult enterprise.

The System, Performance Objectives, and the Curriculum

Verne Haubrick emphasized in his observations the influence of external conditions on the community college. In his opinion the social system and its institutionalized educational structure are more important factors than the internal organization of community colleges and the attitudes of their faculty members. The American educational system is truly bureaucratic and hierarchical, from kindergarten to graduate school, and it is stubbornly resistant to change. That is why he views the community college as essentially conventional. Generally speaking, it is as concerned with extending adolescence and credentialing for the job market as other public post-secondary institutions. Significant innovation must be credited primarily to the private college.

For Dr. Haubrick, this makes a behavioral objectives approach to learning suspect. Who sets goals and objectives? The system, he answered, with the teacher usually acting as its agent. Learning objectives should come in part from the students themselves, who need more self-defining activities if they are to grow into responsibility for their own education and lives. A behavioral objectives approach to learning is too narrow. Concomitant and related outcomes are equally important, and teachers are needed who recognize this fact.

Bob Press disagreed about the usefulness of performance objectives. In his experience stated objectives remove the mystique of teaching and the teacher by helping the student know where he's going and when he has performed well.

Discussion of the teaching-learning process led to the question of what ought to be taught, especially the curriculum for the nontypical student. If teachers start with the proposition that the student's learning experiences ought to be built on what he already knows, there is still the question of what he ought to learn and how the teacher can help him acquire new knowledge, expand the boundaries of his life, and develop occupational skills. Yet it is clear that the teacher can charge knowledge with new interest by bringing it closer to the student's experience. Bill Moore pointed to the example of the "upside-down curriculum" that gets the student involved in something that is consistent with his personal goals and interests from the time he enters college. By implication, the definition of what is worth knowing grows out of the interaction over a period of time between the student and those of his teachers who raise questions, provide resources, clarify alternative answers, and reinforce the student's confidence in what he can become.

One discussion group expressed the opinion that if we are only teaching survival skills to the oppressed, the ghetto won't change. Poor and minority students need skills that will improve their economic situation and change the community. That is, for example, the argument for helping them learn a version of standard English which is more widely negotiable than their dialects.

Institutional Climate

The nontypical student needs structure, but structure should not be confused with dominance or rigidity. Time is a basic element in any course or program structure. Students are not alike in their rates of development. The growth in the proportion of "high risk" students of all kinds in the community college has made it abundantly clear that a developmental approach to education requires a far more flexible time matrix for the completion of tasks by students who have not been conventionally prepared for college.

The problem of time illustrates the fundamental importance of the entire institutional climate. It is not just a question of the individual teacher's talent in working with poorly schooled or culturally different students. The student's sense of acceptance, his commitment to learning, his active use of resources--all depend on how the institution as a whole makes him feel about himself, his place in the college and the community, and the part that learning can play in his life.

At the same time, the concerned attention of understanding teachers is a basic condition of education for all community college students, especially those who enter with serious deficiencies in communication skills. Bill Moore reported that, in his extensive experience, the best students profit most from programmed learning. Students who are less well prepared need the personal attention of skilled teachers and developmental specialists.

Criteria for Remedial Programs

Since a comparatively high proportion of students come to the community college without adequate verbal or computational tools for further learning, remedial instruction is an essential part of the community college's function. While the workshop opposed the stigmatizing effect of segregating and labelling students with basic skill needs, it recognized the necessity to provide remedial resources and defined some of the criteria for developmental education:

1) Careful evaluation of skills at entrance which does not assume comprehensive deficiencies but diagnoses the individual student's specific needs.

2) Active, informed counselling that guides the student toward the right resources and provides personal support while he is mastering the college situation and working out his goals.

3) Individualized planning of the student's program for at least the first year, or as long as necessary.

4) The use of techniques which are individually appropriate. For example, it is self-defeating if talkers are asked to begin their college studies by writing and writers by talking.

5) Extensive individual guidance and tutorial aid should be available.

6) The student's peers can be especially helpful as tutors, at the same time relieving faculty of some of their load.

7) Remedial work must been seen by the student as legitimate and important. This means that, since he is operating within a system where credits are accumulated toward eventual graduation, he should be given credit for anything he does successfully. Presumably, graduation itself should be the final reward for reaching qualitative (or developmental) goals as well as compiling credit.

8) The student should be able to progress at his own speed; his advancement should not be blocked by a lock-step course pattern. The curriculum should be flexible enough for him to move to a higher level complexity whenever he is ready.

9) He should not be confined to courses in communication skills during his first terms. From the start, he should be involved in learning something that holds personal interest for him.

10) A variety of experiential, audiovisual, and programmed learning resources should be available to the student, together with instructors and specialists who know how to bring them to bear on his needs and problems.

A Good Teacher Knows Where You're Coming From

During its second day, the workshop had the opportunity to hear the views of three students on the qualities of the good teacher. Sam DeBose, a graduate of Thornton Community College now at Governors State, summed up his feelings this way: "A good teacher or counsellor is a guy who knows where you're coming from and deals with you as a person with your own interests." If there was a recurring theme in this workshop's discussions, he had distilled it most succinctly: a good teacher knows where you're living and the external conditions you've survived on your way to college--including over-crowded schools and deadening instruction; your struggle with your own self-regard; the sense of defeat that hangs in the air all the time; your difficulty envisaging the career possibilities that may be open to you.

The students were asked, "Among your peers, which people would you like to see go into community college teaching?" In reply, they listed a dozen characteristics:

1) The prospective community college teacher should be a person who can express the needs and hopes of his students.

2) He should be someone who wants to bring about change in the community.

3) Rather than being the kind of person who likes to show off, he should enjoy give and take, "looking into the student," as Lenore Mendoza put it.

4) He should be willing to start with the student where he finds him, Vivian Moore said.

5) He should have the ability to relate to the student as a human being; people shouldn't be afraid to come to him.

6) "He should have," Sam DeBose said, "whatever goes out and gets a feeling about the lives of others."

7) He should be easily accessible outside class.

8) He should give the student the benefit of the doubt.

9) A good teacher should be able to exercise foresight, a capacity to plan, organize, and delegate responsibility to his students.

10) He should also have the ability to move and change, to try new things.

11) He ought to be the kind of person who can focus on the work at hand and help the student master it, making use of evaluation techniques which will help students in their efforts to learn.

12) Finally, he should speak a language which is understandable to his students.

It is revealing to contrast the standards proposed by these three student panelists with Bill Moore's report of the criticisms he heard in sixty rap sessions with inner-city community college students about their teachers. Our teachers, they said, don't understand our language, life style, cultural heritage, heroes, or relations outside class, and they are unaware of our emotional and economic burdens. They don't build continuities between the subject matter of our courses and our life experience. Subject-matter is regarded as sacrosanct rather than something subject to questioning and reorganization. ("Open door, closed curriculum.") Teachers aren't secure enough to expose their own ignorance, so why do they expect us to expose ours? They're running scared.

The Teacher As Learner

Jewel Graham suggested a useful perspective for any discussion of teacher preparation and in-service training. When teachers see themselves as learners, she said, they don't get trapped by the impulse to remake students in their own image.

The first step is designing any program for the preparation of community college teachers is to get student needs and the professional curriculum together. Many in the group believed that teacher preparation should revolve around the community--more exactly, the kinds of people served by community colleges--and that graduate programs should concentrate on attracting community college graduates. Before making their final commitment to the profession, teaching candidates should be closely acquainted with their prospective students and have a clear picture of the community college as the most complex teaching situation in our national system.

A panel of community college teachers cited four ingredients for sound pre-service programs:

1) Education in human relations, including race relations.

2) Community involvement, including extensive experience as participants in community activities.

3) Fewer classes in pedagogy and more teaching practice.

4) Well-designed internships in community colleges.

They wanted the community colleges themselves to play a much larger role in teacher preparation, echoing the observation that community colleges damn the universities for their inaction but fail to use their influence--now considerable--to press for a collaborative approach to preparing professional personnel for community college teaching, counselling, and administration. Illinois and California were mentioned as examples of states where there are no university programs for training community college teachers even though they are among the leaders in developing community college systems.

Bill Moore stressed the importance of in-service as well as pre-service training and also proposed the recruitment and reorientation of high school and perhaps other teachers in the light of the current manpower surplus. With the help of the group, he listed some of the ingredients needed in the education of five community college constituencies: the board, administration, teachers in service, student teachers, and advisory committees. Most of the content for in-service and pre-service training overlapped. It included:

1) The history of the community college.

2) Its national and local role.

3) Characteristics of the honor, average, and nontypical student, with emphasis on the last.

4) Instructional strategies and techniques; manipulation of subject matter to meet student needs.

5) Curriculum planning.

6) Comparative learning environments--inner city, urban, and rural.

7) Psychology of the young adult (growth and difference).

8) Evaluation and self-assessment techniques.

9) The counselling role of the teacher; counselling styles and techniques.

10) Specialty teaching.

11) Knowledge of professional developments and of tools such as audio-visual aids and programmed learning.

12) Institutional role structure.

After naming a component in a projected professional curriculum, Dr. Moore pointed out, we must still develop its content and a rationale for it. Courses should be described in a syllabus that states their purpose, goals, objectives, and organization.

Jim Gallagher challenged Dr. Moore's approach. Rather than listing the courses a prospective teacher should take, he insisted, it would be preferable to decide what we want a person to know when he has finished his studies. It is better to ask what a student needs and make alternative routes available for him to reach his goals. "Does every cat have to go through the same maze?"

The final question, it leads directly to the second workshop.

THE SECOND WORKSHOP

At the second workshop, held in mid-November 1971, each participating institution was represented by a mixture of old and new faces. Rutgers University, Essex County College, and Green River Community College were added to the group, bringing the number of institutions involved in the workshop program to a total of fifteen.

Building on the first session's exploration of the problems and issues of teaching in the community college, the purpose of the second workshop was to develop general guidelines for the development of professional teacher-preparation programs in the regions represented by the universities, state colleges, and community colleges taking part. The following questions were addressed in advance to the November workshop:

1. What criteria, if any, should guide the selection of students for teacher preparation and the evaluation of their progress?

2. How should subject-matter content be approached and how should it vary for different areas of teaching?

3. What kinds of community involvement, job experience, and professional practice should be part of preparation for community college teaching?

4. How can community colleges themselves effectively participate in the preparation of future teachers?

5. How can the future teacher best learn to recognize and appreciate the differences among community college students and place his emphasis on helping all students succeed?

6. In what ways can he gain adequate knowledge and understanding of a wide range of teaching skills and resources?

7. To what extent should the future teacher's learning environment anticipate what might be desirable in community college teaching, counselling, and administration?

To sharpen our sense of a community college that concentrates on inner-city needs, the group visited the host institution, Kennedy-King College of Chicago. Getting out of our commercial ghetto for a day concentrated our focus on the human reality that we were talking about in windowless isolation.

Knowing How Living Is Done

Speaking out of his long experience as a junior college teacher and teacher of junior college teachers, Roger Garrison shared with us his insights into how the teaching-learning process can be designed "to help people cope with their insistent present."

He asserted that we miss the point when we confine ourselves to a narrow approach. Teachers haven't been able to live in enough different ways "to know how living is done," he said. What is really needed is a kind of breadth, openness, and variety of experience in teacher-education programs.

We want competent, flexible, and humane people to staff our community colleges. The original aim of teacher preparation was to produce individuals with the qualities that used to be associated with liberal education, but professionalism in the worst sense led to domination by a guild which was contented with a standardized collection of lecture courses.

In Garrison's view, the overriding obligation of the teacher is to help students gain self-direction in learning so that they can manage their own lives. The typical college student no longer exists. In community colleges, the median student age is 24 to 26, many are over 35, half are married, many divorced, and a substantial number of the men have been to war. Often they are not comfortable with formal learning. They are seeking not only job skills and social mobility but self-worth. With students like these, subject matter is less important than the way it is brought to the student. The question of teaching style is not superficial because the teacher's style communicates an attitude toward learning and human relations.

Unfortunately, Garrison feels, community college teachers are typically more concerned with the subjects they teach than the people who are in their classrooms to learn with their help. Instead, they should be "people-need" oriented. Subtle and sophisticated skills are required to connect people and the subject. Like their older colleagues, younger teachers are susceptible to the "phalanx method" of instruction instead of recognizing that there are a variety of productive styles of teaching and learning. Like methods and techniques, styles must also be selected. "We may treat our students with decent humanity personally, but it doesn't necessarily follow that we treat them decently professionally."

Overcoming Second-Handedness

In Garrison's view, "The secret of mediocrity in academia is second-handedness." Course structure, content, and teaching methods are handed down from generation to generation of teachers without enough effort on the part of most to grapple with the problems and objectives of what they are teaching in relation to the expectations, needs, and experience of their students.

Garrison raised the fundamental question that in his opinion should be posed to both the beginning and experienced teacher: "What is the nature of the subject you teach and how do you teach it? Can you, for example, write down the three most important things you want your students to be able to do after taking your course?"

More specifically:

1. What are the three most important operational skills for your students to keep on learning in the subject? (This question assumes a broad definition of "skills," including intellectual, organizational, interpersonal, and physical capabilities.)

2. What pacing alternatives are available? The secret of learning is pace, and the same pace can't be forced on everyone.

3. How are the gains made by students in a particular learning experience to be evaluated in a way that is consistent with its objectives?

4. Do you know who your students are so that you can take advantage of their experience and interests in designing the course?

Garrison pleaded for the inclusion of whatever enlightenment is available from educational research in the preparation of community college teachers. "They need to know more about what is known about learning." Above all, they should be aware of the abilities and disabilities of their own students and have some competence in diagnosing them. For example, writing should stay with the need for descriptive concreteness until the student learns how to do it well. Teachers must learn to live with a mix of strengths and weaknesses, using their talent to help students overcome their weaknesses by building on their own strengths.

Two-Way Acculturation

"More will be demanded of us as teachers as the resources available to our colleges shrink in proportion to the number of students we are serving." The question of handling larger numbers more effectively is inescapable, no matter what our convictions about class size may be. The prospective teacher must be introduced to the hardware and software available to him. He also needs to learn how to use his students as learning resources for one another.

Reviewing his own work as a teacher-educator, Garrison is convinced that the best way to learn to teach is as a paid intern with day-to-day guidance from able senior faculty members. Learning to communicate as a teacher means learning the student's language. This is as true of the technician teaching his trade to beginners as it is of the humanities teacher. Each has to define specific modular sequences and learn to communicate them in a language understandable to the student.

Learning a portion of the student's language, his idiom, represents a needed attitude change on the part of the community college teacher. As the first workshop stressed, the teacher should try to put himself in "the other fellow's mocassins"--as far as he can. It is a matter of understanding frames of reference that are foreign to the teacher rather than artificially adopting the student's slang, dress, or style. Where significant cultural

differences exist, what is needed is genuine "two-way acculturation," not phoniness. In this turnabout, students can teach teachers by helping them with their own acculturative learning. Any organized teacher preparation should include direct intercultural involvement and the critical examination and interpretation of new experience.

Sam Kelly asked Garrison what differences exist that are significant in terms of meaning rather than style, and what the implications of these differences are for teacher preparation. He observed that emphasis on style can produce the cult of those who display "in" symbols. "I think that subject matter is really where it's at, and self-management isn't language that fits my educational goals. I agree that the teacher should know students as well as possible, but is it realistic to urge us to know them as individuals?"

Garrison replied that he meant that the teacher ought to be acquainted with their characteristics as a group and why they are in college. We should be using what students bring to our classrooms with them, so we need to know what it is. "The dominant culture is a reality, and students need to know how to navigate it." Style is a way of communicating, of involving the student in the learning process.

The teacher is always faced with the challenge of content as well as style and method. He has to select what he wants to bring into the awareness of his students. Garrison cited two examples. After reading The Prince, a class was asked to prepare an agreed strategy for subverting and destroying their own college, based entirely on Machiavelli's thought. Or there was the chemistry teacher who wanted his students to be aware of the ecological impact of a particular chemical process. He proposed the assumption that what goes into a city must pile up or be shipped out. The class assignment: "Find out what happens to a beer can." He was not only teaching them a lesson in ecology; they were also learning about the conservation of matter and energy.

What is needed is maximum mileage from minimum material, Garrison concluded. "Get the student to dig enough deep post-holes and he'll string his own fence." Later he added that, in preparing community college teachers, we can only persuade the student to dig deeply enough if his education is "less academic and more intellectually subtle and rigorous."

Selecting Candidates

The group turned again to a recurrent workshop concern: how can individuals with the best prospect of becoming good community college teachers be identified and attracted into the field? Several basic questions were fired at the group:

Gerry Williams wanted to know, Who selects prospective teachers, how and why?

Bill Lauroesch asked, Who is educable as a teacher? And he went on to say that the candidate has to have his head together so that he can address himself to other people's needs.

Sam Kelly asked if we could propose something that would be more concrete and unique than existing selection methods. "The greatest deterrent to prospective teachers is the teacher next door in the intern school." Who's going to provide on-the-ground guidance in our ideal program?

Some Preliminary Questions

At this point the group split up into four regional groups to pinpoint some of the questions that should be given attention in the effort to frame guidelines for a new approach to community college teacher preparation.

Illinois

1. How can the capacity of candidates for empathizing with those whose ethnic and cultural backgrounds differ from their own be determined?

2. Can an institutional selection procedure be developed that includes students?

3. Can a self-assessment process be built into the entire program through the intern year, so that the primary burden of determining whether or not he is qualified to be a community college teacher can be placed on the student himself?

New England

1. What's the big hang-up about credit in the admission of community college graduates to four-year institutions?

2. How can the community colleges themselves participate in the preparation of teachers? The group pointed out that the University of Western Florida is working with five community colleges in its vicinity which have made commitments of time and money to a joint teacher education program.

New Jersey

1. What is the role of a community college in community involvement and action?

2. How can teachers learn to integrate subject matter and pedagogy?

3. Can the community college teacher preparation programs get candidates with the needed personal qualities?

Washington

1. If teacher preparation is to be a cooperative undertaking between the two-year and four-year institutions, what is the best approach to identifying the things each partner can do best?

2. Shouldn't the community colleges themselves describe the characteristics they are looking for in prospective teachers?

3. In locating candidates for a new kind of teacher preparation, can we not begin with people already associated with community colleges?

The Flooded Maze

On the second day we were joined by Chandler Dennis, who teaches physics and engineering at Essex County College, and his intern associate, David Griffiths. They described their approach to science teaching in a developmental program. Each student brings experiences that can be matched by concretely demonstrating scientific principles. By linking science education to the student's own environment, they have been able to help him acquire not only manipulative skills but also cognitive understanding of physical processes. If a cat can be inventive in a flooded maze, Dennis asked, why can't a human being see alternative solutions to difficult problems when he is thrown into them? The trouble with Skinnerian theory is that it assumes a passive human being incapable of responding to problems imaginatively and unpredictably.

"Students know how to function in their own life situation. I know the structure of my discipline. I must ask myself what the student's cognitive structures are. They don't 'see' Newtonian laws at work in their world. They abstract from their own experience of physical reality. My goal in teaching is to match student cognitive structures with the structure of my discipline. If I can't manage to do this, remedial work is likely to be wasted."

Even in an exact science, he stressed, "the opportunity to deny" must be given to the student. At Essex County College, the science program draws on the experience of students, recognizing that concrete operational mastery doesn't give a student the ability to generalize a problem. "We've designed our program to begin where students are in their cognitive development in order to reduce their resistance to the structure of scientific thought."

Good Interns Dig People

David Griffiths said that until he went to Essex County he hadn't met any teachers. "I'd met a bunch of people who were lecturers." But the people he worked with in the community college required teaching rather than lecturing. "At first a remedial science course didn't have any meaning for me. Instead, it was a hassle. It seemed that they wanted innovation for innovation's sake. Those of us who were black interns thought whites were experimenting on blacks, and we didn't like it. But all the interns could come across with was the standard lecture approach. I covered what I wanted to cover. Then I found that even my best students were missing important things, and that makes you feel bad. I was hitting hard on subject matter, but realized after awhile that sticking to classical physics wasn't teaching, it wasn't helping people to learn physics. A friend confronted me with the question, 'What is physics?' I found out that I couldn't answer it well and realized that we had learned skills in graduate school but had no overview of the subject. It isn't enough just to be versed in the information and skills of your field.

"I had the standard, uninformed view of the community college. At college, I never taught my teachers anything; I just prepared myself to pass exams. At Essex County I found that I was teaching all kinds of people, including older people, and I knew I just couldn't keep coming out of the same bag in communicating with them. I had to learn from them, too."

Interns need to start tutoring early, Griffiths said. "Good interns dig people and people dig them--they're willing to jump into any opening they get. At Essex County we're expected to teach, study, and get involved in the community--the community is the community college."

Dennis reported that they had tried various kinds of groupings in the developmental program, including ability groups, but had finally settled on dividing students between smokers and non-smokers. "That worked as well as any other arrangement." The average age is 28 and the average number of students is a group of five. Students formerly in the program have proved especially helpful in providing a communication bridge. "You need helpers who aren't strung out on the fancy laws of physics."

A workshop participant who started college after a long prison term and is now a college staff member asked, "What is education? What do people mean when they say you should get it?" He went on to explore an answer. "You have something coming off the streets, but you need to organize it, find out what you have. After eight years in prison I still didn't know what I knew, so first I had to find that out, to learn who I was.

"Now, how does an instructor find out what a student knows and use it? The biggest step is for him to put away 'I know it' and share the learning experience with the student. When two people are learning together, that shared knowledge is tremendous."

Someone responded that that is what a good developmental program does: it starts with real world experience as a base and ties into it. Developmental work is a shared process, an interweaving of existential experience and formal learning. The intern who hasn't lost contact with the sources of his own life and culture is best able to communicate with students.

Science provides opportunities to learn how to isolate problems and solve them. How can we do the same kind of thing in the social sciences and humanities? How can we "change the hustle," make learning a different kind of thing, bring it closer to the lives and needs of our students? Perhaps we can begin with the simple assumption that learning how to learn is the oldest human survival skill.

As the groups prepared to separate again to work on guidelines for regionally-oriented community college teacher preparation, Dudley Dawson underscored the necessity to find ways of bridging the gap between different orders of reality, modes of thought, and styles of communication.

Conclusion: A New Collaboration

The Chicago workshops demonstrated to anyone who is seriously interested in improving community college teaching that programs jointly fashioned by two-year and four-year institutions are likely to have the muscle and connective tissue needed to multiply the number of community college teachers who know the difference between education and schooling. The touchstones for this new collaboration can be found in Roger Garrison's observations on overcoming second-handedness through two-way acculturation and on making the teacher's education less academic and more intellectually vital.

The guidelines for preparing community college teachers that emerged from the four regional subgroups in the second workshop paralleled one another on some of the most basic questions about program design (see the appendices). The groups did not of course recommend the wholesale adoption of any one plan, such as the Masters College Program; that was not the purpose of the workshops. But the degree of agreement between individual educators from a variety of institutions scattered through four parts of the country points toward the kind of education being sought by a new breed of American teachers--those who want to break away from conventional preconceptions of the college student so that they are able to respond creatively to the needs of both "typical" and "nontypical" students.

The four regional groups proposed cooperation between communities, community colleges, and state colleges and universities in the development of experience-based programs for community college teacher preparation. At least implicitly, they all wanted to distinguish with a greater degree of sophistication between the personal qualities brought by the student to his formal educational experience and what happens to him as a result of organized learning. That is why the groups recommended selection procedures

that involve a triangulation of perceptions from three angles: the community, that is, those with whom the prospective teacher will be working in the community college; community college faculty and administrators; and faculty and fellow-students of the four-year institution. For the same reason, they urged an evaluation process which combines self-assessment with performance evaluation by the teaching intern's community college students, his peers, and critic-teachers.

As the groups saw it, there is another dimension of experience which is an essential ingredient of the teacher-candidate's development as a teacher and person: involvement in a variety of community subcultures. All of the guidelines assume that the student should be directly acquainted with the social environments which shape the values and expectations and self-images of a cross-section of community college students.

None of them fell into the trap of a monolithic approach to the acquisition of the insights and skills needed to be a resilient community college teacher. Each group concluded that techniques of teaching and learning should be chosen for their relative usefulness in reaching specific objectives, and that various modes of teaching signal to students what is worth knowing and doing. Teaching methods rest on social assumptions and prejudices as much as they do on educational theory, and inevitably they reveal the teacher's feelings about other people, justice and injustice in human relations, and the character of a good society.

The shortcomings of teacher education at all levels, from nursery through graduate school, have been exposed, debated, and sent to hell. A few proposals and experiments have gone beyond jeremiads to the imaginative revision of goals and programs. Among the new models are the Masters College Program and other intersecting concepts which would bring social realities and needs into productive confrontation with the ideals which the best of our educational thinkers have articulated for the nation's community colleges.

APPENDIX I: ILLINOIS

Governors State University
and
Associated Community College Representatives

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHERS

I. Applicants should exhibit:

   A. Humaneness

   B. Flexibility

   C. Prior competence

   D. Ability to empathize with students

II. A selection committee should be established to interview prospective teacher trainees.

   This committee should include representatives from a senior college, a community college, the community, and students in the program.

   The committee should ask questions designed to obtain the following information from the candidate:

   A. Philosophy of education

   B. Past academic and work experience

   C. Association with people of different social and ethnic backgrounds

   D. Emotional stability

   E. Attitude toward new ideas

III. The trainee will plan his career goals upon entering the program. These goals will be used as criteria for evaluation of his progress. They should also be an evaluation of the student by his peers, the student, and faculty.

IV. Common core courses:

   A. Social dynamics

   B. Developmental psychology

   C. Milti-ethnic studies

   D. Historical and social foundations of community colleges

E. Logic

F. Counseling and testing

V. Internship

Trainee should select an advisory committee:

A. One person from a senior college

B. One person from a community college

C. One person in the trainee's discipline

Interns should begin practice with upper-level courses.

VI. Community involvement

The trainee should be required to become involved in the community, or in one similar to the community in which he plans to work during the first year of the program. This involvement can be through community colleges, community groups, or job experience.

Community work during the intern period should be through programs at a community college only.

APPENDIX II: NEW ENGLAND

University of Massachusetts

and

Associated Community College Representatives

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHERS

I. Phases of program development:

A. Negotiation -- formation of consortium of institutions to play active roles

B. Conceptualization (see III below)

C. Operation (logistics, nitty gritty, etc.)

D. Evaluation

E. Modification (essentially a loop back to B above)

II. Phases of program development by steps:

A. Formation of consortium
   1. 3-5 community colleges
   2. Regional distribution
   3. Variety (urban, technical, etc.)

B. Identification of key personnel to form nucleus of adjunct faculty

C. Use of instruments and other means to specify desired characteristics to be developed by prospective community college teachers

D. Sorting out of program-related characteristics and characteristics unaffected by program treatments

E. Delineation of admissions criteria and procedures

F. Establishment of program components to develop desired characteristics and sequence of activities

G. Allocation of institutional resources to program components

H. Planning of workshop for training adjunct and university faculty for coordinated effort

III. Preliminary conceptual model:

A. Design ingredients for a four-year program beginning with junior year, leading to AB and MAT:

1. Strong undergraduate/graduate majors reinforced by related interdisciplinary study

2. Early opportunity for exposure to facilitate self-selection

3. Gradual and deliberate development of familiarity with and comfort in the community college environment

4. Early experience to inform on skill needs

5. Parallel development of substantive knowledge and organizational skills

6. Optional opportunities for community involvement and academic enrichment

B. Possible sequence of components

Year 1

Fall - Multi-institutional observation
Philosophy and mission of community college
Academic development

Spring - Tutoring/advising
Academic development

Summer - (optional)
Community involvement
Academic enrichment

Year 2

Fall - Guest lecturing
Structure of the discipline
Academic development

Spring - Mini-courses
Structure of discipline
Academic development

Summer - (optional)
Community involvement
Academic enrichment

Year 3

Fall - Curriculum development
Substantive reinforcement

Spring - Internship
Integrating seminar

Summer - (optional)
Community involvement
Academic enrichment

Year 4

Fall - Internship
Integrating seminar

Spring - Synthesizing seminar
Academic development

APPENDIX III: NEW JERSEY

Stockton State College
and
Associated Community College Representatives

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHERS

(This report is based on notes taken by the workshop summarizer and is incomplete. It should not be taken as representative of Stockton State College and its associated community colleges. Rutgers University was not represented in the working group.)

The group's spokesman questioned a social policy which emphasizes the expansion of community college education. She felt that the community college addresses itself to socially stratified needs and in this way maintains unjust relations in society. Rather tham eliminating "tracking" in education, she argued that community colleges may tend to freeze it, making it a permanent feature of the American higher educational system.

Given the existence of community colleges and their rapid growth, the group suggested the following criteria for the development of programs to prepare community college teachers:

I. Selection. Open admission, anti-tracking, community-oriented policies, and regional selection of students through multi-institutional boards that include students.

II. Curriculum. The standard "solids" plus a core curriculum in community history, including ethnic studies. Role of the community college in America's political econony. Vocational training to meet the real needs of people.

III. Placement. The paid community college internships and an active intern and graduate placement program.

IV. Evaluation. Emphasis on self-assessment and collective appraisal of intern performance.

V. Community involvement. Candidates should work in a variety of community settings and there should be community participation in determining the nature of the community involvement program.

APPENDIX IV: WASHINGTON

Western Washington State College

and

Associated Community College Representatives

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHERS

We offer the following outline as a summary of our group's discussions. In general, we have addressed the questions posed as guides to the second workshop.

I. Assumptions:

A. We should not describe present programs in Washington State except as elements of such programs are instructive to a new model for the development of community college teachers, which is the purpose of these pages.

B. Each group represented at the workshop inevitably can produce a model and these models will contain enough common features to identify both core features of a wide-based program and distinctive features that produce interesting and comparative variations among programs. Certain conditions face each group in terms of existing programs, institutional constraints, and available resources and sponsorships.

II. Identification and selection of participants:

A. The responsibility properly belongs with the consumer, the community colleges. They have been insisting all along that they have special needs, and that they can best describe and identify persons who will become successful practitioners.

B. One key group of such persons would seem to embrace part-time faculty at community colleges, non-teaching personnel who would like to become faculty, older community college students who want to teach in community colleges, persons presently serving as aides, etc. For people already connected with community colleges, motivation and knowledge of the terrain would seem to be self-identifying.

C. The above two statements are seen presently as excluding no particular community college instructional program -- at least potentially. Nor any particular population of students, aides, etc.

D. Senior institutions must accept the candidates identified by the community colleges. This demands that community colleges and four-year institutions work out in advance, and agree on, the criteria and special arrangements that apply to identification, selection, and preparation of candidates. This would seem to be obvious, but often isn't. Here is a critical, co-operative juncture in a partnership program.

E. A dozen persons thus initially selected and well served is better than fifty persons enthusiastically accepted and lost. We ought to know this by now! Neither tokenism nor retreat is the point; ability to fulfill an obligation is the point.

F. Specific administrative and faculty sponsorship of candidates is a must -- initially by the community college; next by the four-year college; eventually by the community college again, as the community college accepts the candidate back into the fold.

III. The program and the process:

A. An analysis of the formal education and the accumulated experience of each candidate should be made by the community college sponsors so that appropriate credit and curricular placement can be given by the four-year institution (or negotiated). Bluntly, this means credit for vocational experience, avocational experience, etc. A thirty year old aide, for instance, is not a nineteen year old transfer student.

B. From this analysis and its acceptance by the candidate and the senior institution sponsors, a "program contract" should be written for each individual. This contract should reflect the implications contained in the last statement under II above.

C. The "contract" must address such multiple elements as field work, internships, regular course offerings, projects, etc., either in specific detail or in relative amount and degree. This, of course, is central to the proposal outlined here. As specifically as possible, time to be consumed -- quarters or years -- must be detailed.

D. The matter of financial support must be considered individually, with the joint efforts of community college, four-year college, and the individual all involved.

E. It is not assumed that the elements of III occur entirely or mostly apart from the community college campus. Individual contracts will determine this.

IV. Initial teaching/career development

A. A better assimilation (induction) procedure into full-time community college teaching should be developed. An important feature of this model is the description and implementation of such procedures by sponsoring community colleges. Factors such as in-service training, team teaching, counseling, evening as well as day classes, etc., come to mind.

V. Conclusions:

A. The financial impact of this model (if implemented) on both institutions would need to be explained in terms of the model's suitability. Cost is a program element and will, inevitably, be treated as such.

B. II, III, and IV demand well-defined and continuous evaluation -- the comparison of intention with achievement.

C. The refinement (detail, exclusion, addition) of items under II, III, and IV should lead to a proposal for funding. A further workshop, or alternative mode, could develop such a proposal in terms of general (all five institutions) and specific (individual institutions) programs, region by region. For instance, WWSC, working with a consortium of northwest community colleges, might focus on preparation of environmental specialists through the agency of Huxley College, a satellite college devoted to ecological and environmental education, or WWSC might use its College of Ethnic Studies for a special program.

APPENDIX V

MASTERS COLLEGE PROGRAMS FOR PREPARING COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHERS

AN ABSTRACT OF A RESEARCH STUDY 1969-71

BACKGROUND ON DEVELOPMENT

In 1969 the Bureau of Educational Research, United States Office of Education, funded a study on a proposed model for a Masters College, projecting a new approach to the preparation of community college teachers. The study was done under the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities with J. Dudley Dawson, Vice President Emeritus, Antioch College, who originated the model, as the project director. The final report, published in 1971, describes the evolved Masters College Concept - its significance as preparation for community college teachers; its endorsement by community college leaders and other educators; and its potential for being developed at five selected colleges and universities.

The Masters College is a combined four-year undergraduate and graduate program which integrates the last two years of college with professional preparation at the masters level. Its students, as prospective community college teachers entering after two years of college, would alternate study and work experience during the first three years of the program with a fourth year as a teaching intern in residence at a community college. A cluster of community colleges would be affiliated with each Masters College Center providing a resource for faculty and student exchanges, for teaching internships, and for mutual sharing in the improvement of teacher preparation. The flexible curriculum and styles of instruction of the Masters College Programs would focus on the student as a learner and would synthesize in the teaching-learning process substantive content with appropriate methodology. Prospective teachers could prepare in one or more of the following teaching areas: general studies, established academic disciplines, or occupational education.

The enthusiastic endorsement of the Masters College concept by a wide range of leaders in higher education reflects an acute awareness of the need for better prepared teachers whose interest and preparation have been focused on the needs of community college students. The manifold expectations of American society for the constantly growing number of community colleges call for new curricular forms, new styles of teaching and counseling, and a new outlook in college-community relations.

A new kind of teacher is needed for ever-increasing community colleges as they serve the interests of a diverse population: younger and older students; groups with a wide range of vocational and educational goals; those upward bound for more higher education and those outward bound for fulltime jobs; those who are well prepared and many who are under-prepared for the programs they have chosen; the affluent and the poor and those in between; all combinations of majority and minority groups. Furthermore, a community college is expected to engage itself through its faculty and students in a variety of services concerned with the development of its community, such as adult and continuing education, joint training projects with business, industry, community and government agencies, and collaboration on local problems.

The community college movement is challenged not only by the enormity of its constantly expanding mandate, but by the call for accountability which now faces all levels of education. Accountability implies institutional responsibility for the attainment of defined goals and objectives as the return rightly due on the investment of time, energy and money, whether public or private. This in turn requires a critical look at (1) the characteristics of the student population being served, (2) the nature and organization of the curriculum, (3) the improvement of the teaching-learning and process, and (4) greater attention to faculty preparation.

The research study concluded that the uniqueness and strength of the Masters College Model is to be found in the synthesis of its several distinctive features. The widespread endorsement of the concept and the recognized viability of its special features in relation to one another, led the study to consider ways and means of establishing Masters College Programs in appropriate colleges and universities. Several institutions with combined undergraduate and graduate study facilities have expressed interest in the Masters College. Five colleges and universities, selected because of interest and other factors of location, personnel, flexibility of program, and community college relations, participated in the latter phases of the study and are now actively considering the establishment of Masters College Programs:

Governors State University, Park Forest, Illinois
Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey
Stockton State University, Pomona, New Jersey
University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts
Western Washington State College, Bellingham, Washington,

Launching the First Masters College Centers

Students

The quality of a Masters College Program will depend on the quality of its students and faculty. Here we do not use the word "quality" in the usual academic sense. The centers will be looking for particular qualities in their students and faculties, qualities which can be formulated with some exactness in relation to the role of the community college teacher and the nature of education and training for these roles.

Since the centers will be offering an unparalleled, sharply focused program, we anticipate that they will receive large numbers of applications. One of the appeals of the program is that it opens up for students a clear but flexible road to a calling just at a point in their lives when a majority of undergraduates are expected to make a serious decision about their major field of study and its relation to preparation for a profession.

There are obvious things that a Masters College Center will look for in its admissions: a sense of purpose, knowledge of and interest in the community college, serious commitment to becoming a community college teacher, evidence of activities related to teaching, range of intellectual and other interests, academic achievement, work experience, interest in people as individuals. In considering hundreds of applicants there are some guides for selection but the process is not simple nor inexpensive. Our study recommends an open-ended experimental approach to admission standards and procedures in the beginning to be modified in the light of experience.

Faculty

Who will teach the teachers? The first step in initiating a center is to merge the process of program design with the selection and preparation of the core faculty for the program, who must themselves serve as individual examples of good teaching. The study recommends that the core faculty of each Masters College Center will provide its central direction, including both the academic and field aspects of the program. They will be responsible for the general education curriculum for all students and serve as the preceptors to individual students. A major segment of the core faculty's work will be concerned with the professional preparation of students who plan to teach general studies in the community college. The specialized preparation for those who wish to teach established academic disciplines or occupational specialities will be arranged with other schools and departments of the host institution or with outside technical training facilities.

The selection of the first group of core faculty is of the most fundamental importance. It should be composed of teacher-scholars with varied backgrounds of societal experiences and with varied academic competences in the fields of communications, mathematics, the natural sciences, the social sciences, the arts and humanities, educational practice and research. Some of the core faculty must be identifiable as able practicing community college teachers. The task of selection will hardly be a simple one. The response of university, four-year and community college teachers, brought out in the study, gives us reason to believe that superior and dedicated core faculty members can be found, some at least from among the younger scholars who are looking for creative opportunities in college teaching. Once selections are made, some lead-time is essential for the core faculty to design the organization of a center's specific version of the Masters College Program.

Role of the Affiliated Community College

Deeply imbedded in the Masters College concept is the crucial factor of a solid working relationship between a cluster of community colleges and each center engaged in preparing community college teachers. Our study did not suggest any formal or corporate structure of affiliation. It can be expected to take various forms, depending on local conditions. The study did outline the attributes of a mutually beneficial relationship as it might be viewed by an individual community college.

1. Affiliation would be on a voluntary basis. Those community colleges forming the cluster of affiliates would be in geographic proximity to a Masters College Center, though no fixed territorial limits need be imposed.

2. Community college affiliates would have representation on an advisory board concerned with the development and administration of the program.

3. Some members of the Masters College faculty would be selected on a leave-of-absence basis from the affiliated community colleges.

4. As an affiliate, a community college would be expected to employ Masters College interns when conditions permit, usually for two-thirds of a normal teaching load. The intern program would naturally provide one source of recruiting fulltime faculty under tested conditions.

5. A Masters College Center would be enrolling from community colleges a number of its students who are interested in teaching thus offering an unmatched opportunity for its affiliates.

6. Among the many mutual benefits of the interchange of students and faculty between the center and its affiliated community colleges, the center could serve as a resource for in-service development of the faculty and staff of its affiliates.

Location and Accommodation of Masters College Program within a Host Institution

Throughout the study it was obvious that there would be major advantages for the Masters College Programs, if they were located within established colleges and universities. This would offer immediate opportunities for technical assistance, academic status, and accreditation. The plan for the Masters College is that the core faculty will draw on other faculty, library and facilities of the existing institution to provide the necessary range of courses and the flexibility of individualized programming. Consequently Masters College Programs will generally be launched as adjuncts to colleges and universities possessing the potential for innovating a new program which integrates across departmental lines undergraduate and graduate education.

At the same time, the overwhelming concensus among the many persons consulted underscored the importance of establishing the semi-autonomous status of the programs within their host institutions. With due allowance for the structure and policies of the present institution, the central considerations in the establishment of a Masters College can be listed as follows:

1. Flexibility of organization and personnel needed to combine the upper two years of undergraduate and the master's degree in a unified program that would integrate substantive content and methodology in preparing community college teachers.

2. A calendar and curriculum making use of the full twelve months of the year to allow the fullest utilization of time for combining study, field experience, and teaching internship within a four-year period.

3. The creation of a core faculty of some twelve members identified on a fulltime basis with the Masters College Program. Ten of the twelve would be devoted to the teaching-learning curriculum of general studies and to preceptorial responsibilities for all students in the program. The two others would be concerned with the advising and placement of students in off-campus experiences and internships. These numbers are based on a predicated eventual enrollment of 400 students (300 in the first three years with 150 on campus at one time, and 100 in the fourth year of internship).

4. Availability within the host institution or nearby institutions of departments or facilities with specialized courses open to Masters College students preparing to teach established academic disciplines or occupational subjects.

5. The setting for working out productive relationships with a cluster of affiliated community colleges ready to participate actively in the development and operation of a Masters College Program.

Budgeting for Permanence

Preliminary studies on the costs of operating a Masters College Program indicate that once the program is established and attains a substantial enrollment, it can be sustained as well, if not better, economically than many other professional programs. Supplementary seed money is needed, however, to assist interested educational centers to initiate Masters College Programs. Perhaps the appeal and significance of this approach in preparing community college teachers is such that it will elicit public and private funding support.

JDD:r
10-12-71